REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the application in view of the comments set forth below.

Specification

Applicants have amended the specification as noted in the Office action to clearly identify the reference patent application that was incorporated by reference by its serial number. Pursuant to M.P.E.P. §608.01(p)(I)(A)(2), the reference patent application that was incorporated by reference was originally identified by attorney docket number, filing date and title of the invention. Further, the title page of the reference patent application that was incorporated by reference and assigned U.S. Application Serial No.: 10/719,871 also includes the same attorney docket number. For at least these reasons Applicants respectfully submit that the reference patent application that was incorporated by reference was sufficiently described to uniquely identify the document, and thus, no new matter is being introduced by way of the amendments to the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification fully complies with M.P.E.P. §608.01(p) and 37 C.F.R. §1.57(b)(2).

Claim Objections

Claim 30 has been amended to correct the typographical error "medial" to read "media" as suggestion set forth in the Office action.

Claims 41-48 were also objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(a) as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, claim 41 was objected to because antecedent basis was provided before two occurrences of "multi-media printer" in that claim. Applicants have amended claim 41 to place that claim in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2

Claims 5-9 and 36-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. However, the claim amendments made herein have provided each limitation with proper antecedent basis, thereby place all claims in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 23, 24 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,151,611 to Sesek (hereinafter "Sesek"). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Sesek fails to teach every claimed feature as required to maintain a rejection of the above claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Regarding claims 1 and 23, Sesek fails to teach or suggest automatically utilizing default media selection parameters for the print operation if a default media selection override parameter associated with the printer is activated. According to claims 1 and 23, a print operation from a print client device is received for selecting a first medium to be used for the print operation. However, when the default media selection override parameter associated with the printer is activated, the default media selection parameters are automatically utilized for the print operation, regardless of the first media selection parameter of the print operation from the client device.

In contrast, Sesek is directed to a data processing system that prints print jobs on a selected printer utilizing the printer properties in effect for that printer at the time that the print job was spooled. *See, e.g.*, Sesek, Abstract. Sesek allows users to temporarily override the default settings of the printer, and these override settings remain in effect a time specified by the user expires, at which time the default printer settings are restored. In other words, according to Sesek, upon receiving a print operation from a print client with a user-defined printer setting, that user-defined printer setting is used to temporarily override the default printer settings. Sesek does not teach that, upon receiving a print job from a print client including a first media selection parameter, using a default media selection parameter for that print operation if a default media selection override parameter associated with the printer is activated.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that Sesek fails to teach or disclose every feature recited in claims 1 and 23 as required to maintain a rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 10, 11, 27, 28, 30 and 32-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,450,571 to Rosekrans *et al.* (hereinafter "Rosekrans"). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Rosekrans fails to teach every claimed feature as required to maintain a rejection of the above claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Specifically with regard to claims 10 and 27, Applicants respectfully submit that Rosekrans fails to teach or suggest, in response to receiving the print operation from the print client device, determining if media selection parameters received from the print client device, including media type and media size, indicated in the print operation are operational. According to Rosekrans, a client selects a printer to which the print operation is to be sent. Then, once the printer has been selected, a "UI Mask file" corresponding to that particular printer is selected and applied to the job-ticket that is to be displayed to the user by the print client. Application of the UI Mask file "grays out" unavailable options for the selected printer or removes such unavailable options from those presented to the user altogether. To initially populate the various option fields in the job ticket available for the selected printer a default value is inserted into each option field. Available options are substituted for unavailable options as the default values to initially populate the job ticket, which is then validated *before* it is transmitted to the server. Rosekrans explains that substitution and validation are the last steps before the client/server ticket is sent to the server. *See, e.g.*, col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 1.

In contrast, claims 10 and 27 require determining if media selection parameters received from the print client device subsequent to receiving the print operation from the print client device. Thus, a print operation from the print client that is determined to be not operational *after* being received can be resolved by using a default media selection parameter. Rosekrans does not address what happens if an option that is selected by the user but turns out to be not operational after being transmitted to the server, such as when the media selected by the user points to an

empty media tray, for example. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 27 are not anticipated by Rosekrans.

With regard to claim 30, Applicants respectfully submit that Rosekrans fails to teach or suggest that the default media selection parameters stored by the configuration memory comprise parameters for identifying a default media to be used for performing a print operation with each of a plurality of different printing technologies. Similar to claim 41, which was previously identified as being allowable, claim 30 requires the multi-media printer to be capable of performing print operations utilizing a plurality of different printing technologies, which Rosekrans fails to teach or disclose.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that Rosekrans fails to teach or disclose every feature recited in claims 10, 27 and 30 as required to maintain a rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 36, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. Rosekrans in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,912,061 to Ozaki (hereinafter "Ozaki"). However, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Rosekrans and Ozaki fails to teach every claimed feature as required to maintain a rejection of the above claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Analogous to claim 41, which has previously been identified as being allowable, amended claim 36 requires the multi-media printer to be capable of performing print operations utilizing a plurality of different printing technologies, which both Rosekrans and Ozaki fail to teach or disclose. For at least this reason Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Rosekrans and Ozaki fails to teach or disclose every feature recited in claim 36 as required to maintain a rejection of that claim under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The remaining claims in the present application are allowable for the limitations therein and for the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. CODO-45506.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: _____ /donald j. firca, jr./ _____
Donald J. Firca, Jr. – Reg. No. 48,140

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: July 15, 2009